

REMARKS

Claims 1-5, 7-14, 16-36, 38-57 and 59-67 are pending. Claims 6, 15, 37, 58 and 66-67 are cancelled. Claim 68 is newly added.

As a preliminary matter, Applicant respectfully requests an interview with the examiner prior to the examiner acting on this Amendment. The purpose of the interview is to discuss the prior art relative to the claimed invention. Additionally, Applicant continues to maintain all of its previous arguments presented relative to this application.

All of the pending claims stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b), or alternatively, under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over Seifried et al. (U.S. 5,531,003, hereinafter “Seifried”) in view of Stevenson et al. (U.S. 6,159,560 hereinafter “Stevenson”), and further in view of Dahlberg et al. (U.S. 5,245,999). Applicant respectfully asserts that Stevenson does not qualify as prior art against the claimed invention. Applicants’ submit a redacted copy of its invention disclosure form. Affidavits under 37 C.F.R. § 1.131 support Applicants’ position that the claimed invention was created before the Stevenson patent. One of the inventors, Lynn M. Seifried, has left Medtronic. We are attempting to locate her in order to get her signature on the affidavit. A Supplemental Response will be submitted that addresses this issue.

Additionally, new claim 68 explicitly states that the “internal hybrid electronics of the IMD are mechanical connected without use of application of thermal energy to achieve an electrical connection between the feedthrough assembly and the IMD.” None of the cited includes this limitation. For at least the reasons stated above, withdrawal of the instant rejections and issuance of a Notice of Allowance is warranted.

Respectfully submitted,

March 12, 2007
Date

/Carol F. Barry/
Carol F. Barry
Reg. No. 41,600
(763) 514-4673
Customer No. 27581